

REGULAR WEEKLY SESSION-----ROANOKE CITY COUNCIL

February 20, 2001

12:15 p.m.

The Council of the City of Roanoke met in regular session on Tuesday, February 20, 2001, at 12:15 p.m., the regular meeting hour, in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, pursuant to Rule 1, Regular Meetings, of Section 2-15, Rules of Procedure, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended.

PRESENT: Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----6.

ABSENT: Council Member C. Nelson Harris-----1.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

COMMITTEES-COUNCIL: A communication from Mayor Ralph K. Smith requesting that Council convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss personnel matters relating to vacancies on various authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by the Council, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Mr. Carder moved that Council concur in the request of the Mayor to convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss personnel matters relating to vacancies on various authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by the Council, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

At 12:20 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess to be immediately reconvened in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, for a briefing by the City Manager on Victory Stadium.

At 12:25 p.m., the meeting reconvened in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with Mayor Smith presiding, and all Members of the Council in attendance.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

PARKS AND RECREATION-STADIUM-SCHOOLS: The City Manager introduced a briefing with regard to Victory Stadium. She advised that on Monday, January 29, 2001, Council held a public hearing regarding options for Victory Stadium and, in advance of the public hearing, a meeting was held with representatives of the high school athletic community to identify their concerns regarding the various proposals. Immediately following the meetings, she stated that Fred Krenson, representing Rosser International, Inc., was contacted to identify various options and alternatives to the proposals that had previously been shared with Council, with an eye toward being as responsive as possible to each concern that was identified, recognizing that there might be trade-offs in the process, but also addressing such issues as the absence or presence of a track facility, accessing the football field, the number of seats on both sides of the Stadium, and how the sun would or would not reflect into the eyes of persons in the press box, members of the football team and the audience. She called attention to concerns related to the flood way, flood plain and levy wall; whereupon, she requested that the City Engineer address certain issues relating to the geographical location of Victory Stadium. Following the City Engineer's presentation, she advised that Mr. Krenson would review two options under study for Victory Stadium renovation and Steve Angelucci, Senior Vice President of ISP Sports, Inc., and Ken MacDonald, Executive Director, SFX Entertainment, were also present to answer questions regarding opportunities and challenges for booking events at Victory Stadium.

In view of the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers flood reduction project, the City Engineer addressed the floodplain and the floodway, and advised that the floodplain area is the area of the 100 year regulatory flood, and within this area is the floodway. He explained that nothing could be done within the floodway that would raise the regulatory flood elevation without a review by the Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA) which has very little latitude to approve these types of encroachments. He stated that a track facility will not fit on the Victory Stadium site without major revisions because it would overlap the boundaries of the flood reduction project to be built on the Roanoke River.

The City Manager pointed out that with any of the Victory Stadium options, it has been anticipated that the elevation of either the field and/or the support facilities would have to be raised up to ten feet.

Mr. Krenson reviewed two concepts for Victory Stadium which are summarized as follows:

Option 1.1

Includes renovation of the existing stadium, keeping the field at the current level, providing football and soccer sports functions and portable stage setup, providing 1,000 permanent chair seats and 4,000 bleacher seats on each side, reconstructing spectator support facilities and reconstructing the press box.

Any stage element must be portable

Any stage will be a temporary setup in the end zone or on the field. As such, it will be marketable only on an occasional, special event basis, just like it is currently.

All stadium support facilities are raised above the flood plain.

All support facilities would be required to be raised approximately ten feet.

City School issues

1. Press box faces east - - desirable
2. Field runs north-south - - desirable
3. Comparable seating capacity on both sides - -5,000/5000 split
4. Track not included in design.

Distances

1. Front row, 50 yard line to football sideline - - 57 feet
2. Front row, permanent stands to front edge of stage - - 284 feet

Overall Total, Stadium and Parking

\$9,664,199.00 (to relocate the fountain add \$65,000.00)

Option 1CC

New Stadium with movable seats, oriented more east-wide, for 8,000

This option includes demolishing the existing stadium, raising the field approximately ten feet, providing football, soccer and track sports functions and permanent stage setup, providing 5,000 permanent chair seats on the non-stage side constructed to allow them to be moved near the stage for small capacity amphitheater events, providing temporary bleacher seating for approximately 3,000 on the stage side, reconstructing spectator support facilities and reconstructing the press box.

Permanent stage element creates more marketable amphitheater

Permanent stage on the southwest side faces an adequate direction for the stage, allows seats located on the field and the opposite side stands to be usable for a more available amphitheater arrangement, particularly when moved closer to the stadium.

Smaller Capacity facility allows the track to fit more simply.

Track oriented SSE-NNW will allow stands and stage to fit within the available space.

All stadium components are raised above the floodplain.

City School Issues

1. Press box faces southwest - - less desirable
2. Field runs NNW-SSE - less desirable; compromise for sports and amphitheater; track in this orientation fits better within floodway parameters;
3. Comparable seating capacity on both sides - - 5,000/3000 split

Distances

1. Front row, 50 yard line to football sideline - 85 feet (without track- 57 feet; without track and without soccer field - 45 feet)
2. Front row, permanent stands to front edge of stage - 330 feet (without track - 284 feet; without track and without soccer - 225 feet). Note: potential for moving stands in this

option would allow “permanent” stands to be moved and located on the field, as close as 75 to 100 feet from the stage, depending on capacity needs.

Overall Total, Stadium and Parking - \$19,572,084.00 (to relocate the fountain add \$65,000.00)

Question was raised as to the frequency of flooding at Victory Stadium; whereupon, staff advised that after reviewing historical records spanning approximately 50 years, it appears that Victory Stadium floods every five to six years.

The Mayor requested information on the number of times that the water level exceeded six inches, as well as the flooding potential over the next 50 years if a flood wall is constructed.

In view of the limitations of the Victory Stadium location, Mr. White suggested that another site in the City be identified, along with the costs to construct a first class high school football stadium for 6000 - 8000 persons and a field for track.

The City Manager stated that given what is now understood to be some of the limitations of the Victory Stadium site, it would be advisable to look at other available sites and costs. She advised that the Roanoke community of today would not support an amphitheater by itself, but in combination with a stadium, it is feasible and could help to market the community. She explained that neither of the options presented by Rosser International allows the opportunity to address the track situation at any time in the immediate future, although it may be possible to create a track after the flood wall is constructed and the flood reduction process has been completed, however, it could be as long as six years before the flood reduction project is completed. Therefore, she stated that the question is: are either of the options agreeable to Council recognizing that the track issue remains unresolved, or should the City think about proceeding as some members of the high school athletic community have suggested and build a track or tracks at the two high schools to accommodate that issue.

Mr. Harris spoke in support of providing a briefing on the two options authorized by Mr. Krenson to the Roanoke City School Board, especially that information regarding the track facility and how the facility relates to floodway/floodplain issues since that has been one of the primary concerns about the Victory Stadium site.

Ms. Wyatt reiterated a suggestion previously made by Mr. Bestpitch with regard to the feasibility of a regional track facility which would help to defray costs and provide a level of valley cooperation. She requested information regarding the cost of a combination track and football field, a football stadium, and a regional and/or separate track facility.

Mr. Angelucci, a concert promoter and manager of the Virginia Beach Amphitheater which is a 20,000 seat facility and the Richmond Classic Amphitheater which is an 11,400 seat facility, advised that he has promoted concerts in Roanoke since 1988, and based upon his experience, Council would be wise to spend a considerable amount of time debating the issue because it is a major decision for the City of Roanoke. He stated that many entertainment artists choose 35 day tours and they select the 35 opportunities that will enable them to earn the most money, contracts are based on attendance, therefore, seating capacity is a key issue, and six to ten shows/events per year is a reasonable number to anticipate.

In terms of marketing, Mr. MacDonald advised that the vitality and viability of the Roanoke market as a location for concerts over the past three years has improved dramatically. He called attention to a recent study which indicates that it is estimated that an average of six to ten concerts could be attracted to Roanoke annually.

Following discussion, it was the consensus of Council that the City Manager be requested to identify the frequency of flooding at the Victory Stadium site since the facility was constructed, including the number of flood incidents as a result of heavy rainfall; the cost of constructing a stadium at a different location, with or without a track facility; the possibility of a regional or separate track facility; to communicate track facility issues as related to the floodway to the Roanoke City School Board; and to report on potential uses of Victory Stadium on a short term basis.

At 1:55 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess to be reconvened at 2:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber.

At 2:00 p.m., on Tuesday, February 20, 2001, the regular meeting of City Council reconvened in the Roanoke City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with the following Council Members in attendance, Mayor Smith presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members C. Nelson Harris, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----7.

ABSENT: None-----0.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The reconvened meeting was opened with a prayer by The Reverend Douglas Turner.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

PRESENTATIONS:

DECEASED PERSONS-ZONING-COMMITTEES: Mr. White offered the following resolution memorializing the late Sydnor W. Brizendine, Jr., who passed away on February 7, 2001:

(#35213-022001) A RESOLUTION memorializing the late Sydnor W. Brizendine, Jr., a lifelong resident of Roanoke and a longtime member of the City's Board of Zoning Appeals.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 63.)

ACTION: Mr. White moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35213-022001. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

The Mayor request that a moment of silent prayer be observed in memory of Mr. Brizendine.

DECEASED PERSONS-CITY EMPLOYEES: On behalf of the Members of Council, the Mayor expressed condolences upon the passing of Mr. Reid Cotton, a City employee who lost his life in the line of duty on Tuesday, February 13, 2001. He requested that a moment of silent prayer be observed in Mr. Cotton's memory.

At 2:10 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess.

At 2:25 p.m., the meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber, with Mayor Smith presiding, and all Members of the Council in attendance.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Mayor advised that all matters listed under the Consent Agenda were considered to be routine by the Members of Council and would be enacted by one motion in the form, or forms, listed on the Consent Agenda, and if discussion was desired, that item would be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately. He called attention to a report of the City Manager which was added to the Consent Agenda requesting a Closed Meeting to discuss a matter of disposition of publicly held real property, pursuant to Section 2.1-344(A)(3) Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.

MINUTES: Minutes of the regular meetings of Council held on Tuesday, September 5, 2000, and Monday, September 18, 2000, were before the body.

(For full text, see Minutes on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Mr. White moved that the reading of the Minutes be dispensed with and that the Minutes be approved as recorded. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

COMMITTEES-SPECIAL EVENTS: A communication from Jay Stephens tendering his resignation as a member of the Special Events Committee, effective immediately, was before Council.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Mr. White moved that the communication be received and filed and that the resignation be accepted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD: A report of qualification of Robert N. Richert as a member of the Architectural Review Board for a term ending October 1, 2004, was before Council.

(See Oath or Affirmation of Office on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Mr. White moved that the report of qualification be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

COUNCIL: A communication from the City Manager requesting that Council convene in Closed Session to discuss disposition of publicly held real property, pursuant to Section 2.1- 344(A)(3), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

(For full text see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. White moved that Council concur in the request of the City Manager to meet in Closed Session to discuss disposition of publicly held real property, pursuant to Section 2.1- 344(A)(3), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

REGULAR AGENDA

HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS:

ACTS OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT-DISABLED PERSONS: Christene A. Montgomery, Chair, Mayor's Committee for People with Disabilities, expressed appreciation for the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. She called attention to issues and responses relating to the Carvins Cove Reservoir Study, more timely notice of meetings of the Mayor's Committee for People with Disabilities so that persons with disabilities may plan for and attend meetings,

separating Wasena and Smith Park plans, additional parking spaces for the handicapped near the Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, closed captioned for the hearing impaired on RVT Channel 3, appointment of persons to committees who are aware of cross-disability issues, and appropriation of funds totaling \$161,220.00 for remodeling four City recreation centers and seven park shelters to be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

She commended the Deputy City Manager, James D. Ritchie, for his cooperation and assistance.

(See report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that report would be received and filed.

COMPLAINTS ROANOKE NEIGHBORHOOD PARTNERSHIP-HOUSING/AUTHORITY: Ms. Gloria Dorma advised that on October 4, 1999, she appeared before Council in connection with neighborhood development issues, and since that time, certain neighborhood plans have been completed by City Planning staff. She further advised that on October 4, 1999, she requested that the City clearly define the term "multi-family" housing as to location and number of units in a specified area so as not to create an "asphalt jungle". At that time, she stated that she spoke in support of constructing housing units such as duplexes in residential areas throughout the community that would meet the criteria for low income housing, she expressed concern regarding the concentration of multi-family housing in northwest Roanoke, and requested that the City prepare a neighborhood plan for northwest Roanoke before any additional multi-family housing is constructed.

Ms. Dorma reiterated her October 4, 1999, remarks and requested that appropriate legal terminology be included in the neighborhood plan(s) for northwest Roanoke to prevent developers from constructing large housing developments in one concentrated location and eliminating open or green space within the housing developments.

ACTION: Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the remarks of Ms. Dorma would be referred to the City Manager and the City Attorney for appropriate response.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

BUDGET-PENSIONS: A communication from Council Member William White, Sr., recommending that the matter of consideration by Council of a permanent cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for all City retirees be referred to fiscal year 2001-02 budget study, and that the City Manager and the Director of Finance be requested to survey other Virginia governmental retirement plans and recommend an appropriate percentage increase for Council's consideration during budget study sessions, was before the body.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Mr. White moved that the matter be referred to the City Manager and the Director of Finance to survey other Virginia Governmental retirement plans and to recommend an appropriate percentage increase for Council's consideration during fiscal year 2001-02 budget study. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wyatt and unanimously adopted.

TAXES-SPECIAL PERMITS: A petition from the Blue Ridge Small Business Development Center, Inc., dba The New Century Venture Center, requesting tax-exempt status on real property located in the City of Roanoke at 1354 Eighth Street, S. W., pursuant to Section 30 - 19.04(B) Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

(For full text, see petition on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Mr. White moved that the matter be referred to the City Manager and the City Attorney for study, report and recommendation to Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and unanimously adopted.

BUDGET-SCHOOLS: A communication from the Roanoke City School Board requesting appropriation of \$3,024.00 in additional State funds for the Governor's Academic Challenge for Success program, advising that the program will provide additional instruction time for students who received a school year 2000 accreditation rating of "Accredited with Warning" in mathematics or English and are at-risk of not passing the Standards of Learning assessments, said program to be one hundred per cent funded by State funds, was before Council.

A report of the Director of Finance recommending that Council concur in the request of the School Board, was also before the body.

(For full text, see communication and report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Carder offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35214-022001) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2000-2001 School and School Capital Projects Funds Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 63.)

ACTION: Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35214-022001. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS:

CITY MANAGER:

BRIEFINGS:

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS-HENRY STREET REVIVAL COMMITTEE-DOWNTOWN NORTH: The City Manager introduced a briefing on activities/accomplishments of the Roanoke Neighborhood Development Corporation. She advised that Council Member Hudson, at the Council meeting on Tuesday, January 2, 2001, requested a briefing on the RNDC project, including financial information on the amount of funds appropriated by the City to the project since its inception and accomplishments to date; whereupon, she called upon Stanley R. Hale, Executive Director, for remarks.

Mr. Hale introduced RNDC Board members in attendance, i.e.: Council Member Linda F. Wyatt, Vernice Law, President, The Reverend Johnny Stone, N. L. Bishop, and Cynthia Bryant. He called upon Melinda Payne, the City's liaison to RNDC, to present the briefing.

Ms. Payne advised that as the RNDC Board of Directors began to think about where they were headed with the project, they realized that former Mayor Noel C. Taylor initiated the idea of revitalizing the Henry Street area more than two decades ago; and RNDC was created as the community component of a public/private partnership with the City of Roanoke in response to Dr. Taylor's

appeal. She stated that RNDC is a non-profit community-based organization partnering with the City of Roanoke and the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority to facilitate revitalization and development in an area of the City which was once referred to as the Greater Gainsboro Development area. She advised that RNDC wishes to enhance the quality of life in the City of Roanoke, specifically Henry Street and surrounding residential neighborhoods; and the RNDC Board is composed of Roanoke citizens, although some might not now live in the immediate area, who are committed to Gainsboro through the importance that the community played in their personal development or development of their ancestors. She explained that RNDC has a new project manager, Stanley R. Hale, President and CEO of Southwest Virginia Community Development Fund; a new master plan is under development, along with selection of an architect; a new design will reflect the essence of the Gainsboro neighborhood; and a contract has been entered into with Coptly and Company to assist with marketing and other pre-construction startup activities. She called attention to the importance of completing the vision for a better Gainsboro, the final cornerstone of the legacy of Roanoke's oldest settlement or community which predates the incorporation of Roanoke as a city. She advised that the most historical site in Gainsboro is Henry Street which once served as the most popular dining, entertainment and commercial district for black residents of Roanoke and surrounding areas before integration; and the Dumas Hotel serves as a reminder of those times. She further advised that there is much to appreciate in Gainsboro; i.e.: the Lawson building which houses the Southwest Virginia Community Development Fund and also serves as RNDC's current headquarters, Gainsboro Library, Hotel Roanoke, Social Security offices in the former Stone Printing building, the Higher Education Center which is the first of three major projects planned for the area, Shenandoah Crossing in the near future with groundbreaking scheduled for this year, and to complete the vision is the RNDC catalyst project, Crew Suites, which is to be located at the intersection of Henry Street, Wells Avenue and Gainsboro Road. She explained that Crew Suites will occupy approximately 45,000 square feet of commercial office building space which will include a portion of Roanoke City's Department of Social Services, housing between 150 - 200 service related jobs. She advised that project objectives include: lease commitments for at least 60 per cent of the space by September 30, 2001, with construction to begin by November 2001 and project completion by October 2002, and the Board of Directors of RNDC is committed to insuring that Crew Suites fits in with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Hale advised that the Board of Directors of the Southwest Virginia Community Development Fund agreed, at the request of RNDC in October 2000, to provide the necessary staff support and leadership to the project and in order to be successful, the project, will require community support and support from City Council and the City administration. He further advised that after assuming his position, he performed a quick assessment as to where the RNDC project is and

where it needs to go. He stated that realistic objectives were established and a team was appointed to help accomplish objectives which will include an architect to be hired within 30 days, and a real estate management firm which has already been employed (Copty and Company) to assist with marketing and other pre-start up activities.

Vice-Mayor Carder called attention to the Gainsboro Neighborhood Plan and the Outlook Roanoke Plan and addressed the importance of insuring that the development efforts of RNDC mirror and support efforts of the Outlook Roanoke Plan.

ACTION: Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the briefing would be received and filed.

COMMUNITY PLANNING: The City Manager introduced a briefing on the City's Vision 2001 - Comprehensive Plan.

Brenda McDaniel, Member of the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee, advised that the theme of Vision 2001 is to imagine the future of Roanoke, but at the same time, to keep the soul; it was realized that before a vision could be created for Roanoke by imagining the future, it was necessary to find out what citizens perceive to be special about Roanoke, and by asking citizens what they thought was unique, a planning process could begin that recognizes Roanoke's strengths, as well as those areas that need improvement.

She advised that in October, 2000 citizens were invited to the Roanoke Civic Center to share their thoughts and suggestions, and the following themes surfaced as a result of the forum:

Think Regionally/think big. Be confident about the future of the City and region.

Protect the environment: mountains, ridgetops, viewsheds, streams, parks and green ways are an important resource and provide the foundation for a great quality of life in Roanoke.

Economic Development: Keep pace with current and emerging technologies; market Roanoke's environment, recreational and cultural attractions.

Capitalize on new technology as an economic development engine and to provide greater access to workforce development, education, and information.

Downtown: celebrate successes in revitalizing and re-energizing the downtown area.

Transportation: build great urban streets for vehicles and people, with trees, sidewalks and bikeways that add value to the City and its neighborhoods; continue to support and expand air transportation.

Education and schools: a healthy, attractive public school system is a very important asset in attracting and retaining families in the City.

People: People of all ages and backgrounds should be encouraged to be active participants in City life, especially youth as they are the future leaders of the City.

Ms. McDaniel stated that because the Comprehensive Plan deals with many aspects of the life and work of its citizens, six Task Teams were formed to address a wide variety of issues ranging from code enforcement to solid waste management, from brownfields to green ways, from neighborhoods to regional economic development and from schools to technological infrastructure, among others.

She advised that on January 25, 2001, a public draft containing the results of the task team meetings was presented and the meeting was important because it enabled the Advisory Committee to set priorities for the next phase of the planning process which will end on May 30, and will focus on specific ideas that have surfaced to the top of the plan; ten groups called “Roundtables” will define ideas dealing with technology, housing, economic development initiatives, creating measures for a healthy community, creating multi-service centers, design guidelines for streetscapes and transportation corridors, selling Roanoke to newcomers, residents and visitors, strategies for funding critical cultural and recreational amenities, looking at the potential for development of underutilized or vacant sites, enhancing neighborhood commercial centers by thinking of them as village centers, and much more; “Roundtables” are open to the public and will consist largely of committee members, task team members and City staff, the purpose of which is to add more depth to the plan and to test the ideas that have been raised several times during the process in an effort to see if and how these ideas can be molded into recommended programs, projects and policies, and citizens will be asked to think about a timeline for the recommendations.

Ms. McDaniel explained that on May 5, the Advisory Committee is expected to view a draft plan; staff and consultants will take comments and schedule another public forum where citizens will again comment and provide feedback on the draft plan, and shortly thereafter, the plan will be presented to the City Planning Commission and to City Council.

ACTION: Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the briefing would be received and filed.

ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR ACTION:

BUDGET-COMMUNICATIONS DEPARTMENT-EQUIPMENT: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that Council authorized an 80 MHz Regional Radio system and entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Roanoke County in 1997 for installation and maintenance of the system; the radio system was placed into use in 1999 for Public Safety and is now being used by all departments in the City; and \$101,000.00 was included in the Transfers to Capital Projects Fund as part of the adopted General Fund budget for fiscal year 2000-01 in support of maintenance for the project.

The City Manager recommended that Council appropriate \$101,000.00 to the Radio Project Account for annual maintenance purposes.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Harris offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35215-022001) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2000-2001 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 63.)

ACTION: Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35215-022001. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

BUDGET-GREENWAY SYSTEM: The City Manager submitted a written communication advising that in 1999, the Lick Run Greenway bicycle/pedestrian lane was completed from the I-581 interchange to Valley View; the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission recently received bids on completion of the next phase of the Lick Run Greenway, which will extend from the I-581 interchange to Court Street; design work will begin soon on the final phase that will continue the Lick Run Greenway to The Hotel Roanoke; and the Lick Run Greenway will be a part of a City-wide greenway system, with each portion being constructed as funds become available.

It was further advised that the Greenway Commission received five bids ranging from \$124,800.00 to \$233,747.55, with L&S Plumbing and Excavating Company of New Castle, Virginia, submitting the low bid; the Greenway Commission Steering Committee voted to accept the bid from L&S Plumbing and Excavating Company; the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission set aside \$104,000.00 and is requesting \$32,000.00 from the City of Roanoke to complete the project; of these funds, \$20,000.00 will be used for construction as designed and \$12,000.00 will be set aside for a ten per cent contingency fund; and funding in the amount of \$125,110.00 from proceeds of the sale of Westview Terrace, Account No. 008-1329, is available for greenway development.

The City Manager recommended that Council appropriate \$125,110.00 from Account No. 008-1329 to a new account entitled, "Greenway Development"; the money will be used to fund the City system of greenways and drawn upon as each portion is constructed; and that Council further authorize payment of \$32,000.00 to the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission for completion of the Lick Run Greenway from the I-581 interchange to Court Street from said new account.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Harris offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35216-022001) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2000-2001 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 63.)

ACTION: Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35216-022001. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

CITY CLERK:

SCHOOLS: The City Clerk submitted a written report advising that on June 30, 2001, the three year terms of office of Melinda J. Payne and Ruth C. Willson as Trustees of the Roanoke City School Board will expire; pursuant to Chapter 9, Education, of the Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, establishing a procedure for the election of School Trustees, Council must hold certain meetings and take certain actions during the months of March, April and May to conform with the selection process, therefore, the concurrence of Council in establishing the following dates is requested:

- (1) On Monday, March 19 at 6:00 p.m., Council will hold an informal meeting (reception) which will be open to the public with all candidates for School Trustee in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building.**
- (2) On Monday, March 19 at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, Council as a Committee of the Whole, will review and consider all candidates for the position of School Trustee. At such meeting, Council shall review all applications filed for the position and Council may elect to interview candidates for such positions.**
- (3) On Monday, April 2 at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, Council will, by public vote, select from the field of candidates, those candidates to be accorded the formal interview and all other candidates will be eliminated from the School Trustee selection process. The number of candidates to be granted the interview shall not exceed three times the number of positions available on the Roanoke City School Board, should there be so many candidates.**
- (4) On Monday, April 16 at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, Council will hold a public hearing to receive the views of citizens.**
- (5) On Thursday, April 19 at 6:00 p.m., Council will hold a meeting for the purpose of conducting a public interview of candidates for the position of School Trustee.**

- (6) On Monday, May 7 at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, Council will hold an election to fill the two vacancies for terms commencing July 1, 2001, and ending June 30, 2004.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's office.)

ACTION: Mr. White moved that Council concur in the above referenced dates. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and unanimously adopted.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

TRAFFIC-PARKS AND RECREATION-BRIDGES-STREETS AND ALLEYS:

At its meeting on Monday, February 5, 2001, Council received a briefing by the City Manager with regard to one way traffic on Wiley Drive for the entire length of Wasena and Smith Parks, the matter was again before the body. On February 5, Council voted to accept the report of the City Manager with the request that City staff report to Council by Tuesday, February 20, 2001, on the implications of not including Wasena Park in the proposed plan, pending completion of the flood control project on the Roanoke River by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers and that any plan which is submitted to Council will address requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Also on February 5, Vice-Mayor Carder requested that the City Manager review the matter of installing stop signs at pedestrian crosswalks, and the posting of 13 mph as opposed to 15 mph speed limit signs.

The City Manager submitted a communication in response to questions raised by Council Members at the February 5 meeting, as follows:

School Bus Access - Vertical clearance at the Franklin Road Bridge is limited to approximately ten feet; regular size school buses require at least ten feet six inches of clearance; regular size buses are the only vehicles that can accommodate handicapped students; smaller buses that are available in the fleet will not accommodate handicapped students; therefore, City staff recommends that the grade on Wiley Drive be lowered by two feet to provide the required vertical clearance, at a cost of \$20,000.00.

Americans with Disabilities Act access - The plan is fully ADA compliance; it will provide handicapped accessible parking immediately adjacent to the ADA accessible restrooms in Smith Park; all parking areas will include handicapped van accessible parking spaces; all pedestrian crossings will meet ADA requirements, and the plan also proposes an ADA accessible fishing deck in Smith Park.

Speed Limit Posting - Staff has researched the effectiveness of the suggested 13 mph speed limit posting; literature on the subject indicates that such signs are ineffective, such posting of odd speed limits is contrary to accepted practice as published in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

Stop Signs - Staff believes that adequate traffic calming measures have been included in the project and recommends that stop signs at pedestrian crossings be considered as a future option of progressive traffic control measures.

The City Manager further advised that the current budget allocated for proposed improvements is \$200,000.00, and budget needed to complete all improvements, including those in the Wasena Park segment is \$325,000.00; the project can be designed to meet the existing \$200,000.00 budget by a corresponding reduction of project features such as planting boxes, pedestrian islands, and/or parking; if the project scope is modified to address only the Smith Park segment, the proposed \$200,000.00 budget is adequate; project construction will be expedited and it is estimated that the project can be completed within 120 days of Council's endorsement of a plan.

(See communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Hudson expressed concern with regard to spending taxpayers' money on Wasena Park before completion of the flood control project by the U. S. Army Corp of Engineers. He advised that he supports the greenway system, however, other persons use Wasena Park besides walkers, joggers and bicyclists. He called attention to ball fields and picnic areas that are used regularly by the public at large in Wasena Park, therefore, his vote will be based on what is best for all citizens of Roanoke. Mr. Bestpitch advised that the intent was of his motion on October 16, 1999, was to reach a reasonable compromise between those who wanted Wiley Drive reopened to two way traffic and those who wanted Wiley Drive to remain closed to all vehicular traffic, and the compromise was essentially to provide that the same \$200,000.00 that had been appropriated for the traffic calming project could be used to extend a one way option, not only through Smith Park but all the way to the far end of Wiley Drive at the west side of Wasena Park where Wiley Drive intersects into Winchester Avenue. He further advised that it was his intention to spend no additional money other than the \$200,000.00 previously budgeted to provide a type of greenway experience along that section of the Roanoke River through Smith Park and Wasena Park which would allow those persons who desire a vehicle-free surface on which to walk or ride their bicycles to have one-half the width but two times the length through both parks. He stated that an additional \$20,000.00 to lower the

surface of the roadway and to provide clearance under the bridge at Franklin Road is a reasonable addition to the budget. He added that if the U. S. Army Corp of Engineers develops a flood reduction project that impacts the area, the planter boxes could be relocated to Smith Park, and the distance between the planter boxes could be decreased which will not be a waste of taxpayers' money, and would provide a boost to the greenway project in a relatively short period of time at a small financial investment.

Mr. White advised that Wasena Park should be kept separate from Smith Park until the U. S. Army Corp of Engineers completes its flood reduction study, and requested that the record reflect that he voted against the motion on October 16, 1999, and will continue to vote against any motion that includes the Wasena Park segment.

Vice-Mayor Carder and Council Member Harris advised that they understood and supported the October 16, 1999, motion of Mr. Bestpitch because it represents a good compromise and doubles the greenway for basically the same amount of money.

Ms. Wyatt questioned whether the planting boxes can be relocated. She advised that some changes will be made as a result of the flood reduction study by the U. S. Army Corp of Engineers and it would be a waste of taxpayers' money to knowingly proceed with the project when it will have to be changed in a short period of time. She advised that she agrees with the concept of greenways, however, if there will be a major impact on the Wasena Park portion of the project, it is prudent to hold that part of construction in abeyance until the City knows exactly what it can and cannot do in regard to the flood reduction project.

The City Engineer clarified that the planting boxes are substantially large structures that they can be moved to another location with the use of heavy equipment, therefore, the planter boxes located in Wasena Park could be recycled and moved to Smith Park if necessary. He advised that Smith Park could be addressed without Wasena Park and City staff is familiar with the location where the flood reduction project will impact the area.

Question was raised as to whether the project of the U. S. Army Corp of Engineers will have an impact on the existing road in Wasena Park, to which the City Engineer responded in the affirmative, and advised that that portion of the road between the two parking lots will be removed and replaced with an off road trail that is set back and the proposal of the Corp of Engineers is to remove that portion of the road in Wasena Park. He stated, however, that the road would still exist for Smith Park because the Corp of Engineers flood reduction project does not propose any improvements in Smith Park.

Upon question by a Member of Council, the City Engineer advised that Wasena Park and Smith Park includes a total of 154 planting boxes valued at \$800.00 each totaling \$123,200.00, which provides for one planter box every 50 feet (90 planter boxes in Smith Park and 64 in Wasena Park). He further advised that the number could be cut in half to provide 45 planter boxes in Smith Park and 32 in Wasena Park, which would provide approximately a \$60,000.00 difference in cost. He noted that the spacing on the planting boxes is critical to the traffic calming effect they should provide and 50 feet spacing is appropriate to achieve a traffic calming effect; i.e. as a vehicle is passing one planting box, another box would be in immediate view, and if spacing is increased from 50 to 100 feet, the effect is diminished.

The City Manager clarified that her recommendation includes the elimination of a \$40,000.00 parking lot, therefore, that \$40,000 could be applied to additional planting boxes which would allow planting boxes to be spaced closer than every 100 feet.

Upon question, the City Engineer advised that his recommendation would be to space the planting boxes at distances of every 50 feet in order to achieve the traffic calming effect that is needed.

Ms. Wyatt moved that Council approve one-way vehicular traffic through Smith Park, with the inclusion of planting boxes and lowering of the grade on Wiley Drive by two feet to provide the required vertical clearance at the Franklin Road Bridge, at a cost of \$200,000.00 which was previously allocated for the project, plus an additional \$20,000.00 to be taken from the Contingency Fund for lowering the grade. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.

The Mayor advised that whatever decision is made will not satisfy all parties in interest, however, he expressed concern with regard to spending over \$200,000.00 on the project before the flood reduction project is completed by the U. S. Army Corp of Engineers. He stated that Council should hear the comments of citizens who were present out of their concern regarding the matter before voting on the motion offered by Ms. Wyatt, seconded by Mr. Hudson; whereupon, Ms. Wyatt raised a point of order. She advised that Council Members Bestpitch and White had expressed a desire to speak, all other members of Council had been given the opportunity to speak, therefore, professional courtesy dictates that Council Members Bestpitch and White be permitted to address the body before hearing comments by citizens.

The Mayor advised that he had previously recognized Mr. Bestpitch on several occasions during the discussion and without objection by Council, he would proceed with citizen comments.

Hearing no objection, the Mayor called upon the first speaker; whereupon, Ms. Wyatt moved that Council Members Bestpitch and White be permitted to present their remarks prior to comments by citizens.

ACTION: The motion failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Thomas Dannel, 2210 Charlevoix Court, S. W., spoke in support of leaving Wiley Drive open to vehicular traffic to be accessed both ways. He advised that spending over \$200,000.00 of taxpayers' money for planting boxes is a waste of funds and requested that Smith Park be left open for all citizens to enjoy. He called attention to other facilities in Roanoke that joggers, walkers and bicyclists can use which are located away from vehicular traffic such as public schools Victory Stadium, etc.

Ms. Ann Lemon, 3169 Westridge Road, S. W., advised that her generation is not impressed with the way Smith Park and Wasena Park have been managed in the past and they have taken advantage of other options to relocate to other cities where urban parks are provided that are safe, clean and more user friendly for people who want to participate in all types of recreation, including walking, jogging, biking, etc. She asked that Council, as its number one priority, make the park more user friendly for those persons who want to use the area as a park. She called attention to safety hazards for joggers and bicyclists, etc., who are forced onto the roadway along with vehicles because the bridge and some portions of the shoulder of the road are narrow. She added that the park is not safe or user friendly because of vehicular parking which attracts undesirable persons who harass pedestrians, and asked that vehicular traffic be one way through Wasena and Smith Parks with the other half turned into a greenway.

Ms. Barbara N. Duerk, 2607 Rosalind Avenue, S. W., advised that it is important for Council to have a vision and, more importantly, that the vision be implemented. She stated that in the discussion sessions regarding Vision 2001, references were made to the need for greenways and for Roanoke to be a healthy community. She referred to discussions regarding the delay because of the U. S. Corp of Engineers flood reduction project which could be as long as ten years in the future, however, Roanoke needs a facility now for citizens of the community to enjoy. She stated that there is a need to connect Wasena Park to Smith Park to River's Edge to Piedmont Park and a greenway for these parks would allow economic development to proceed.

Mr. Duane Howard, 508 Walnut Avenue, S. W., spoke in support of leaving Smith Park closed to vehicular traffic. He referred to the Parks and Recreation Ten Year Master Plan which calls for the construction of two multi-purpose recreation facilities, yet, Smith Park in its present form, offers more recreational opportunities for a more diverse class of people than any building man could ever hope to build

and it is already paid for and in full use. He advised that in the years ahead, Smith Park will be looked upon as a major contributing factor to the health and vitality of not only the City of Roanoke, but the entire region, and any action by Council other than keeping the park closed to vehicular traffic is a wanton act of total disregard for the time, money and effort that it took to produce the City's Parks and Recreation Master Plan which represents the wishes of Roanoke's citizens.

Ms. Patty Vipperman, 208 Windward Drive, S. W., suggested that the park be kept closed to vehicular traffic until there is some determination with regard to the flood reduction project. She advised that recently, on a day when the climate was not conducive to outdoor recreation, she observed numerous joggers, bicyclists and walkers, etc., enjoying Smith park, therefore, if such a large number of persons were taking advantage of the park on a cold day, it would seem a disservice to open the park to vehicular traffic.

The Mayor called attention to the following messages from two citizens who wished to have their positions noted for the record:

Ms. Anne Jennings, 2710 Rosalind Avenue, S. W., would like for Wiley Drive to be open for one way traffic and a pedestrian walkway.

Ms. Beverly W. Pugh, 848 Wildwood Road, S. W., would like for Wiley Drive to be closed to vehicular traffic.

The Mayor called upon Mr. Bestpitch who had previously asked to be recognized; whereupon, Mr. Bestpitch asked that Ms. Wyatt reconsider her position and support a plan of action that will provide the most for the money invested.

Mr. Harris called for the question. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

ACTION: The motion offered by Ms. Wyatt, seconded by Mr. Hudson, to approve one-way vehicular traffic through Smith Park, with the inclusion of planting boxes and lowering of the grade on Wiley Drive by two feet to provide the required vertical clearance at the Franklin Road Bridge, at a cost of \$200,000.00 which was previously allocated for the project, plus an additional \$20,000.00 for lowering the grade, was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----4.

NAYS: Council Members Harris, Bestpitch and Carder-----3.

INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS: None.

MOTIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

INQUIRIES AND/OR COMMENTS BY THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL: None.

OTHER HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS:

LEGISLATION: Ms. Evelyn D. Bethel, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., inquired if Council receives citizen input regarding topics that are included in the City's Annual Legislative Program and, if so, what are the requirements for including a project in the Legislative Program. Even though the City's 2001 Legislative Program has been submitted to the City's representatives to the General Assembly, she further inquired if the document can be amended.

All items presented under Other Hearing of Citizens are automatically referred to the City Manager.

COUNCIL: The Mayor called attention to the Financial Planning Session of Council which is scheduled to be held on Saturday, March 10, 2001, at 8:30 a.m., at the Hotel Roanoke Conference Center.

At 5:10 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess.

At 6:45 p.m., the meeting reconvened in the Council Chamber, with Mayor Smith presiding, and all Members of the council in attendance, with the exception of Vice-Mayor Carder who left the meeting during the Closed Session.

ACTION: COUNCIL: With respect to the Closed Meeting just concluded, Mr. Harris moved that each Member of City Council certify to the best of his or her knowledge that: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in any motion by which any Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-BLUE RIDGE COMMUNITY SERVICES: The Mayor advised that there is a vacancy on the Blue Ridge Behavioral Healthcare Board of Directors created by the resignation of Ann Janney-Schultz, and called for nominations to fill the vacancy.

Mr. Bestpitch placed in nomination the name of Sherie Bernath.

There being no further nominations, Ms. Bernath was appointed as a member of the Blue Ridge Behavioral Healthcare Board of Directors, for a term ending December 31, 2003, by the following vote:

ACTION: FOR MS. BERNATH: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-ZONING: The Mayor advised that the terms of office of Clay Grogan and Joel W. Richert as members of the Board of Zoning Appeals expired on December 31, 2000, and called for nominations to fill the vacancies.

Mr. Bestpitch placed in nomination the names of Clay Grogan and Joel W. Richert.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Grogan and Ms. Richert was reappointed as members of the Board of Zoning Appeals, for terms ending December 31, 2003, by the following vote:

ACTION: FOR MR. GROGAN AND MS. RICHERT: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-ROANOKE NEIGHBORHOOD PARTNERSHIP: The Mayor advised that the three year terms of office of Lular R. Lucky and William E. Skeen, and the one year terms of office of Barbara N. Duerk and Charles W. Hancock, as members of the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership Steering Committee, expired November 30, 2000; and there is a vacancy on the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership Steering Committee created by the resignation of Mark E. Petersen; whereupon, the Mayor opened the floor for nominations to fill the vacancies.

Mr. Bestpitch placed in nomination the names of Lular R. Lucky, William R. Skeen, Barbara N. Duerk and Charles W. Hancock.

Mr. Hudson placed in nomination the name of Michael W. Ridenhour.

There being no further nominations, Ms. Lucky and Mr. Skeen were reappointed for terms ending November 30, 2003, Ms. Duerk and Mr. Hancock were reappointed for terms ending November 30, 2001, and Mr. Ridenhour was appointed for a term ending November 30, 2003, as members of the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership Steering Committee, by the following vote:

ACTION: FOR MS. LUCKY, MR. SKEEN, MS. DUERK AND MR. HANCOCK, AND MR. RIDENHOUR: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-PARKS AND RECREATION: The Mayor advised that there is a vacancy on the Mill Mountain Advisory Committee created by the resignation of Barry L. Thomas, and called for nominations to fill the vacancy.

Mr. Harris placed in nomination the name of Michael A. Loveman.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Loveman was appointed as a member of the Mill Mountain Advisory Committee, for a term ending June 30, 2001, by the following vote:

ACTION: FOR MR. LOVEMAN: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU:
The Mayor advised that the term of office of Sunny Shah as a City of Roanoke representative to the Roanoke Valley Convention and Visitors Bureau expired on June 30, 2000, and called for nominations to fill the vacancy.

Mr. Harris placed in nomination the name of Sunny Shah.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Shah was reappointed as a City of Roanoke representative to the Roanoke Valley Convention and Visitors Bureau, for a term ending June 30, 2001, by the following vote:

ACTION: **FOR MR. SHAH:** Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-COURT COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BOARD: The Mayor advised that the term of office of William H. Cleaveland as a City of Roanoke representative to the Court Community Corrections Program Policy Board expired on December 31, 2000, and called for nominations to fill the vacancy.

Mr. White placed in nomination the name of William H. Cleaveland.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Cleaveland was reappointed as a member of the Court Community Corrections Program Policy Board, for a term ending December 31, 2003, by the following vote:

ACTION: **FOR MR. CLEAVELAND:** Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-ROANOKE VALLEY RESOURCE AUTHORITY: The Mayor advised that the term of office of Robert K. Bengtson as a member of the Roanoke Valley Resource Authority expired on December 31, 2000, and called for nominations to fill the vacancy.

Mr. White placed in nomination the name of Robert K. Bengtson.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Bengtson was reappointed as a member of the Roanoke Valley Resource Authority, for a term ending December 31, 2004, by the following vote:

ACTION: FOR MR. BENGTSON: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

ACTION: Inasmuch as Mr. Bengtson is not a resident of the City of Roanoke, Mr. Harris moved that the City residency requirement for persons serving on authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by the Council be waived in this specific instance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted.

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-BUILDINGS/BUILDING DEPARTMENT: The Mayor advised that the terms of office of John D. Fulton, Jr., and Tommy L. Dowdy as members of the Property Maintenance Code, Board of Appeals, expired on November 10, 2000, and called for nominations to fill the vacancies.

Mr. White placed in nomination the names of John D. Fulton, Jr., and Tommy L. Dowdy.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Fulton and Mr. Dowdy were reappointed as members of the Property Maintenance Code, Board of Appeals, for terms ending November 10, 2005, by the following vote:

ACTION: FOR MR. FULTON AND MR. DOWDY: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-AIRPORT: The Mayor advised that the term of office of J. Granger Macfarlane as a member of the Roanoke Regional Airport Commission will expire on March 31, 2001, and called for nominations to fill the upcoming vacancy.

Mr. Hudson placed in nomination the name of J. Granger Macfarlane.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Macfarlane was reappointed as a member of the Roanoke Regional Airport Commission, for a term ending March 9, 2005, by the following vote:

ACTION: FOR MR. MACFARLANE: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-CULTURAL SERVICES COMMITTEE: The Mayor advised that there is a vacancy on the Cultural Services Committee (City Manager's designee), created by the resignation of Beverly James, and called for nominations to fill the vacancy.

Mr. White placed in nomination the name of Mary Neal.

There being no further nominations, Ms. Neal was appointed as a member of the Cultural Services Committee (City Manager's designee), by the following vote:

ACTION: FOR MS. NEAL: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

At 6:50 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess until 7:00 p.m.

On Tuesday, February 20, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., the Roanoke City Council reconvened in regular session in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with the following Council Members in attendance, Mayor Smith presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members C. Nelson Harris, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch, and Mayor Ralph K. Smith----6.

ABSENT: Vice-Mayor Carder-----1.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The reconvened meeting was opened with a prayer by Council Member C. Nelson Harris.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ZONING: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Tuesday, February 20, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of CHS, Inc., that a tract of land lying on the south side of Melrose Avenue, N. W., and the west side of 24th Street, commonly known as W. B. Clements, Inc., containing approximately 10.149 acres, more or less, identified as Official Tax No. 2420205, be rezoned from C-2, General Commercial District, to IPUD, Industrial Planned Unit Development District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the petitioner, the matter was before the body.

A communication from Michael G. Ballantyne, Senior Vice President, Carilion Health System, representing CHS, Inc., requesting that the petition for rezoning be withdrawn, was before the body.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the petition for rezoning would be withdrawn.

ZONING: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Tuesday, February 20, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of VFW Post #1264 that a tract of land lying on the west side of Grandview Avenue, N. W., between Empress Drive and Marr Street, identified as Official Tax No. 2270223, continue to be zoned C-1, Office District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the petitioner, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Friday, February 2, 2001, and Friday, February 9, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

A report of the City Planning Commission advising that in October, 1995, the property was conditionally rezoned from RS-3, Residential Single-Family District, to C-1, Office District, for the purpose of constructing a child day-care center according to a proffered development plan; the day-care center was not constructed, the property remains zoned C-1, Office District, and is still subject to the following proffered conditions of the previous rezoning, was before Council:

“The property will be developed in substantial conformity with the site plan prepared by Keith Somers, dated July 22, 1995, a copy of which is attached to the Petition for Rezoning, as Exhibit B, subject to any changes required by the City during site plan review.”

It was further advised that VFW Post #1264, Inc., has a contract to purchase the subject property for the purpose of constructing a new meeting facility; and the contract purchaser desires to retain the existing C-1 zoning, but amend the proffered conditions in order to provide for a revised development plan to accommodate the proposed facility.

The City Planning Commission recommended that Council approve the request to amend the proffered conditions on said property, with the understanding that a Fourth Amended Petition, which was discussed at the City Planning Commission public hearing, will be filed prior to Council’s public hearing. It was advised that the rezoning request is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan and will have minimal effect on the surrounding residential neighborhood; inclusion of sidewalks will be beneficial to the neighborhood and re-location of the principal building on the northern end of the site near existing commercial uses will provide a development with greater open space at the southern end of the property adjacent to residential uses.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk’s Office.)

David A. Bowers, Attorney, appeared before Council in support of the request of his client.

ACTION: Ms. Wyatt moved that the following ordinance be placed upon its first reading:

(#35217) AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3 and 36.1-4, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 227, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, in order to amend certain conditions presently binding upon certain property previously conditionally zoned C-1, Office District.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 63.)

ACTION: The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to address Council with regard to the request for rezoning. There being none, Ordinance No. 35217 was adopted, on its first reading, by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

ZONING: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Tuesday, February 20, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of Lorna M. Hall that two tracts of land located at 3034 and 3042 Brambleton Avenue, S. W., identified as Official Tax No. 1650903 and 1650946, be rezoned from RS-3, Residential single-Family District, to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the petitioner, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Friday, February 2, 2001 and Friday, February 9, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

A report of the City Planning Commission advising that the subject properties consist of approximately 1.5 acre and are currently zoned RS-3, Single Family Residential District; and that the petitioner requests that the properties be rezoned to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to certain conditions, in order to use the two existing residential structures on Brambleton Avenue for commercial purposes, was before Council.

The City Planning Commission recommended that Council approve the request for rezoning, and advised that the subject properties are appropriate for low intensity commercial development; proffered conditions address the development and land use of the properties; and existing trees within the landscaped buffer between commercial and residential uses will be retained.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Maryellen F. Goodlatte, Attorney, appeared before Council in support of the request of her client.

ACTION: Mr. Bestpitch moved that the following ordinance be placed upon its first reading:

(#35218) AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 165, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, to rezone certain property within the City, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 63.)

The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to address Council with regard to the request for rezoning. There being none, Ordinance No. 35218 was adopted, on its first reading, by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Vice Mayor Carder was absent.)

ZONING: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Tuesday, February 20, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of Ruth B. Hartman, Kevin M. and Susan T. Walker, and GAD Management, that certain property located at 2109 and 2115 Peters Creek Road, N. W., identified as Official Tax Nos. 6370301, 6370302 and 6370304, be rezoned from RS-3, Residential Single-Family District, to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to certain conditions proffered by the petitioners, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Friday, February 2, 2001, and Friday, February 9, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

A report of the City Planning Commission advising that the proposed rezoning consists of three parcels of land currently zoned RS-3, Single Family Residential District, located at the intersection of Peters Creek Road and Woodbridge Avenue, N. W.; and the petitioners propose to develop the site for a J. D. Byrider franchise, which finances on-site pre-owned cars, was before Council.

The City Planning Commission recommended that Council approve the request for rezoning, pursuant to an executed First Amended Petition to Rezone which should be filed prior to Council's public hearing on the matter.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Cooper Yuille, Attorney, appeared before Council in support of the request of his clients.

ACTION: Mr. Harris moved that the following ordinance be placed upon its first reading:

(#35219) AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 637, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, to rezone certain property within the City, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 63.)

ACTION: The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to address Council with regard to the request for rezoning; whereupon, Mr. Kermit E. Plummer, 1652 Garstland Drive, N. W., spoke in support of the proposed rezoning. He advised that the proposed use will not have an adverse impact on the community or on the City as a whole, and noted that the entire Westview Terrace community endorses the rezoning.

Mr. Merle Whitbeck, 1806 Angus Road, N. W., spoke in support of the proposed rezoning. He commended the petitioner for meeting with residents of the area to answer questions and to explain the purpose of the rezoning. He advised that the proposed structure will set a good example for other business establishments on Peters Creek Road and will be an asset to the neighborhood, while providing an economic benefit to the City of Roanoke through increased taxes.

Mr. Bestpitch advised that the first question Council should ask itself before making a decision is: how much C-2 property currently exists in a particular area of the City and how much is needed. He stated that City Planning staff recommended denial of the request for rezoning, partly in view of the fact that there is other vacant C-2 property in the immediate vicinity, and it is a disservice to current C-2 property owners and business owners in an area when their ability to sell their property is

continually undercut. He inquired as to why a person would pay a C-2 property owner what their property is worth on the commercial market of today when they can purchase a residential property at a lesser price and petition City Council for a rezoning. He stated that the City Planning staff's recommendation further indicates that a C-1 rezoning is more appropriate at this location than a C-2 rezoning, therefore, for the above reasons, he could not support the rezoning and concurs in the recommendation of City Planning staff.

Ordinance No. 35219, on first reading, was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: Council Member Bestpitch-----0.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

POLICE DEPARTMENT-EASEMENTS-CITY PROPERTY-WATER RESOURCES:
Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Tuesday, February 20, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on a proposal to grant a 15-foot easement across City-owned property to Verizon Virginia, Inc., to install underground facilities to provide telephone service to the new police building, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Sunday, February 18, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

The Water Resources Committee recommended that Council authorize execution of the appropriate document in a form approved by the City Attorney.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

ACTION: Ms. Wyatt moved that the following ordinance be placed upon its first reading:

(#35220) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the donation and conveyance of a 15' easement across City-owned property located at 348 Campbell Avenue, S. W., to Verizon, for installation of underground facilities, upon certain terms and conditions.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 63.)

ACTION: The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to address Council with regard to the matter. There being none, Ordinance No. 35220 was adopted, on its first reading, by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Vice-Mayor Carder was absent.)

OTHER HEARING OF CITIZENS:

MISCELLANEOUS: Mr. Robert Gravely, 1412 Moorman Road, N. W., read a prepared statement offering suggestions for unification of the City of Roanoke.

(See statement on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

PARKS AND RECREATION-STADIUM: Mr. Jim Fields, 17 Bridgecrest Road, Hardy, Virginia, spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium.

(Items addressed under Other Hearing of Citizens are automatically referred to the City Manager.)

At 7:55 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess until Monday, February 26, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., in Fitzpatrick Hall, The Jefferson Center, 541 Luck Avenue, S. W., at which time Council will hold a public hearing in conjunction with the City Planning Commission and the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority on the proposed South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan.

The regular meeting of Roanoke City Council which was declared in recess on Tuesday, February 20, 2001, until 7:00 p.m., on Monday, February 26, 2001, at The Jefferson Center, Fitzpatrick Hall, 541 Luck Avenue, S. W., was called to order by Mayor Ralph K. Smith.

PRESENT: Council Members C. Nelson Harris, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----7.

ABSENT: None-----0.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The reconvened meeting was opened with a prayer by Council Member C. Nelson Harris.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

The Mayor advised that the purpose of the meeting is to hold a joint public hearing of the Roanoke City Council, the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority and the Roanoke City Planning Commission to consider approval by City Council at a later date of the proposed South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan and to consider determining at a later date whether the proposed redevelopment plan is substantially in accord with Roanoke Vision, the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan. He further advised that the redevelopment plan relates to the area which is generally east of Route 200 (the Roy L. Webber Expressway), west of the Roanoke River, south of Elm Avenue Interchange with I-581 and north of Wiley Drive and Wiley Road.

The primary purpose of the Redevelopment Plan is to provide for private reinvestment and economic growth through redevelopment by private enterprise. Specifically, the goals of the Redevelopment Plan are to eliminate blight, blighting influences, deteriorations and deleterious land use, to improve business activity and to generate additional economic value for the City of Roanoke, to make the best use of the area's location and urban character, and to provide for a versatile mix of complimentary land uses with the redevelopment area.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Wednesday, February 14, 2001 and Wednesday, February 21, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority members present: Ben J. Fink, H. Victor Gilchrist, James W. Burks, Jr., Christie L. Meredith, and Willis M. Anderson, Chair.

Roanoke City Planning Commission members present were: Robert B. Manetta, Alfred T. Dowe Jr., Richard A. Rife, Gilbert E. Butler and D. Kent Chrisman, Chair.

John P. Baker, Executive Director, Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority, presented a summary of the proposed Redevelopment Plan for the South Jefferson Street area. He advised that the area under discussion extends from Roanoke Memorial Hospital and Victory Stadium up Reserve Avenue to Franklin Road and along both sides of Jefferson Street up to Albemarle and Highland Avenues including much of the Roanoke River front property along that area. He stated that the area qualifies for redevelopment under Virginia law because the existing physical and economic conditions justify public participation to correct physical conditions and to strengthen the economic base of the City of Roanoke. He further stated that the goal is to remove physical conditions that have not generated economic stability and growth in the area and to provide an environment and infrastructure that will encourage private reinvestment and development that will add to the strength of the City's economic base. He advised that not just any area in a city qualifies for the intent of public assistance that is proposed with this redevelopment area; the Virginia General Assembly has determined that many communities have areas that do not contribute adequately to the strength of the city; the poor physical condition of these areas may hurt property values and tax revenues or even pose a health or safety threat to the people in that vicinity; in response, the General Assembly passed a law allowing public funds to be used to purchase private property and to make that property available for private and public redevelopment; and there are a number of reasons the South Jefferson Redevelopment area falls in that category; i.e.:

An economic analysis indicates that from 1994 to 1999, employment fell 15 per cent in the area and gross revenues and wage distributions and personal income decreased while they increased throughout the City. This area lags behind the City as a whole in all economic categories.

Eighty-two per cent of the area is in the Roanoke River's floodplain with flood elevations reaching as high as 17 feet above the finished floor, and has suffered the brunt of major floods. Also, many of the buildings that are there now do not meet the City's requirement for floodplain development.

Significant environmental hazards exist. Buildings located on 28 per cent of the land store or handle hazardous materials. This increases the risk to public health and safety because of contamination during a flood. In addition, several properties may have soil contamination that exceeds human health risk based on Federal screening criteria, and other lots may have been used to store hazardous materials and need further evaluation.

A large per centage of the buildings are so deteriorated that there is either no hope of renovation or they need major repairs which would be a prohibitive cost because the buildings are located in a floodplain.

There are other conditions that contribute to the deterioration of the redevelopment area. Twelve per cent of the lots are vacant or have buildings that are not used; and many of the streets are very narrow and in poor condition, lack sidewalks, and curbs and gutters are in poor condition or do not exist.

Mr. Baker advised that the overall goal of the redevelopment plan is to eliminate factors which inhibit growth and provide a way for private reinvestment and economic growth to take place through private enterprise; and other goals that serve as the basis for the regulations and controls placed on land throughout this redevelopment area are:

To assist in rebuilding, renovating, and relocating businesses and clearing the land of all inappropriate uses and deficient improvements.

To redevelop the land for biomedical and other related businesses that would contribute to economic growth of this area and build the City's tax base.

To build attractive gateways to the area taking advantage of its strategic location next to some of the most highly traveled streets and roads in the City: Jefferson Street, Franklin Road and I-581.

To design a vibrant area with multiple uses including work, play, eating and living along with safe and convenient parking.

Mr. Baker noted that because there are so many significant changes that need to be made to revitalize the area and because there are so many limitations due to the existing conditions, it is necessary to acquire property and specific steps to carry out the redevelopment program are as follows:

All property marked as "to be acquired" on the boundary and acquisition map is eligible to be acquired, and overall, 74 per cent of the area is so deteriorated that it is necessary to clear the property and redevelop the entire area. The property will then be sold to private developers to develop in accordance with the plan.

The Housing Authority will be assisting businesses in their moves to new locations and paying property owners fair market value for their land. All of the relocation activities are run by the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority and strictly follow the requirements set under Virginia law.

The Housing Authority may provide assistance to reuse some of the existing structures for commercial or mixed use with possibly some residential use. This will only be accomplished with private investors when it is economically possible to fix the property up to local codes.

New streets with proper drainage will be built following the guidelines of the City's Capital Improvement Plan. The upgrades include reconstruction of deteriorating side-walks, streets, curbs and gutters. It also includes new street construction, flood reduction construction, landscaping and improved signs.

For the most part, the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority will acquire all the property. However, when an existing property owner's proposal complies with the provisions and intent of the South Jefferson Redevelopment Area Plan, the Housing Authority will work with those owners under a contract agreement to ensure a sound development in accordance with the plan without acquisition by the Housing Authority.

The party responsible for redeveloping property will have to follow certain provisions which include:

Developing the property in accordance with the redevelopment plan and within the designated time frame;

Retaining ownership until the completion of all improvements and construction;

Complying with the land use provisions of the plan;

Meeting City ordinance and code requirements.

Mr. Baker advised that the Housing Authority will be helping those businesses that must be displaced, they are working with owners and will offer help with financial assistance and in finding other business sites and in actually carrying out the move; they will be sensitive to the needs of property owners and so far, two property owners have expressed an interest in developing their property.

He stated that the South Jefferson Redevelopment project provides the opportunity for tremendous redevelopment and economic growth; when complete the project can provide 1.5 to 2 million square feet of building space and could attract up to \$150 to \$300 million in private capital expenditures and up to 2500 new jobs and a significant portion of these new jobs will provide opportunities for skilled technical employees.

Mr. Baker explained that the South Jefferson Redevelopment Program will provide needed land for economic development without destroying existing parks and green space, landscaping will enhance the overall beauty of the area, and river side recreation will be within walking distance which should have a positive impact on property values and create an environment for new development; the attractive urban style lay out will create the kind of work environment that attracts high

technology companies, it will also protect the adjoining residential neighborhoods by strengthening this important area and connect downtown revitalization efforts to the South Jefferson area, and implementation of the plan will allow the City to compete with other jurisdictions with more land available for economic development.

David Hill, representing Hill Studio, advised that the South Jefferson Redevelopment Area Land Use Plan and Design Guidelines are meant to guide new developments by making it fit with local character while raising the quality of environment in the project area. He further advised that the 110 acres of the South Jefferson Redevelopment area holds a remarkable potential to increase the downtown service area by 25 per cent and increase the vibrancy of the area by adding 40 per cent to the square footage of the current downtown. He stated that the addition of this substantial redevelopment can fulfill the design paradigm of Jefferson Street as the main street of Roanoke; some under utilized infrastructure is already in place in existing neighborhoods around the redevelopment area; and proposed buildings in the redevelopment area hold the potential to link the neighborhoods into the proposed development by the placement of greenways, roads, sidewalks, and other key urban design elements. He called attention to two official maps in the redevelopment plan: a land use map and a boundary and acquisition map. He explained that the land use map is proposed as an extension of the C-3, Central Business District types of uses, except that the Housing Authority is trying to become more directed toward biotechnology in this area. He stated that the primary use is for the provision of biomedical research and development as opposed to the traditional downtown office uses, therefore, there are four classifications on the map which move away from current industrial uses toward a more specialized type of downtown use, i.e.: (1) institutional mixed use which is the area for research, biomedical and support of these areas including retail services, day care, etc., or those uses that will support the biomedical campus; (2) support commercial which are uses such as commercial offices, support businesses, the institutional area, hotels, doctor's offices, software manufacturers, prosthetics, rehabilitation centers, etc.; (3) commercial/residential mix which is in particular response to preserve some of the existing architectural integrity for development as flex space; and (4) public use areas which include public walkways, open spaces, plazas and greenways associated with the land use plan.

He explained that the boundary and acquisition map shows the exact boundary proposed for acquisition and includes private property, rights-of-way, and railroad property. He advised that all land is to be acquired for private reuse and public reuse, however, railroad property would not be acquired through condemnation but through negotiation. He explained that the vision for this plan is provided in the master plan; and size and shape of the redevelopment area, history of the area and general patterns contributing to the land use set a condition fostering three variations of guidelines for three distinct areas, i.e.: the first is the Jefferson Street corridor where significant Roanoke property exists and will be a continuation

of existing patterns to make it a great main street for Roanoke; the second is the campus and institutional area with patterns along Reserve Avenue showing the beginnings of a campus development such as the U.S. Naval Reserve building, the National Guard Armory, and the Parks and Recreation building, all of which are set back from the street, created in a post-war time, with a large boulevard between the structures, grass, and constructed of Virginia type materials, all of which work well to begin to create a campus-like setting. He advised that the third area was originally developed with transportation and warehousing in mind, including a village developed at the crossing of the two railroads, the Virginian and the Norfolk and Western, and over a dozen transportation oriented structures were developed including a warehouse, a street car barn and a railroad terminal, and the crossing is a third area of the design guidelines which attempt to carry on the tradition of the building patterns of this area such as large windows, jack arch doors, buildings constructed near the street and small court yards developed within, sloped roofs and continuation of some of the brick and stone patterns.

Mr. Hill explained that the design guidelines address a number of conditions in the area such as administration of the guidelines, buildings and structures, particularly detailing ideas for use of the floodplain which is probably the single largest challenge as to how to berm the north side of Reserve Avenue so as to prevent flooding surges from entering the habitable space of buildings, placement of buildings, height limitations, building materials, facades, roofs and roof top equipment. He advised that there will be a considerable amount of structured parking in the area and each distinct part of the master plan has its own ratios of structured or surface parking; and garage-type structures are proposed similar to those in the downtown area. He stated that surface parking is also addressed requiring landscaping with borders and islands and in some cases paved diamonds and trees. He stated that design guidelines illustrate where signage may be placed, landscaping for buildings, pedestrian areas, grading and drainage, open space and utilities, and called attention to a set of design guidelines that will require high quality development in the area. He advised that connectivity to uses and neighborhoods has been a key component of the plan, including the need for additional streets and access and egress from U. S. 220 and I-581 as well as greenways throughout the area. He stated that the redevelopment plan has been coordinated with ongoing planning assistance including the new Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Roanoke plan update, although the South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan is independent of those two studies. He advised that the redevelopment plan serves as a key stone to visioning for this 110 acres of the City and for the region; in addition to the redevelopment work and design guidelines by the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority, each development proposal will come through the City zoning process involving both the City Planning Commission and City Council; and there is a significant amount of infrastructural design that must take place.

R. Matthew Kennell, President, Downtown Roanoke, Inc., advised that although this area is located just to the south of the existing downtown service district, it is of the utmost importance to the Board of Directors and membership of Downtown Roanoke, Inc. He stated that the project involves a major opportunity to redevelop an underutilized portion of the City and an opportunity to tie downtown Roanoke into the natural environment. He expressed appreciation to the consulting team for working with Urban Design Associates and many citizens as the Downtown Roanoke plan has been updated. He advised that one of the main reasons that Downtown Roanoke, Inc., supports the project is because it will create 2,500 new jobs for not only current residents of the City but it will attract new highly educated residents with technical skills that will help to develop the community. For the above reasons, he stated that the leadership of Downtown Roanoke, Inc., strongly supports the South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan and its ultimate approval.

Mr. Brad Allen, 271 Reserve Avenue, S. W., advised that the project has come a long way and the willingness of the City of Roanoke and the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority to step up to the plate and to address concerns has been remarkable. He asked that the City not forget that the livelihood of business owners is at stake, Roanoke needs to progress, the vision of the plan is exciting and could provide the turn around that the City of Roanoke needs, but at the same time, a realistic look at fair and just compensation for property owners is important.

Beth Doughty, President, Roanoke Regional Chamber of Commerce, advised that the Chamber of Commerce has 1,550 members who requested the Chamber to represent their business agenda with government and part of that business agenda is the fair and just compensation for property owners, but the agenda also involves building a strong local economy that promises sustained economic development and growth to benefit the companies that do business in Roanoke and the people who live and work in the region. She stated that a critical ingredient to building a strong local economy is for the City to insure the best mix of property uses for its commercial corridors and the Redevelopment Plan for the South Jefferson Redevelopment area accomplishes that purpose. She advised that this is an example of sound economic development practices at work by eliminating and mitigating the obstacles that might currently limit development within the City and the plan will encourage development where it probably would not otherwise occur. She stated that the proposed redevelopment area reflects a pattern of stagnation and decline, with declining employment, wage distribution and personal income, which contributes to decrease economic returns to the City and its residents creating a growing burden of a commercial area at well below its highest and best use. She advised that leadership of the Roanoke Regional Chamber of Commerce wants the Roanoke region to achieve its potential as a most desirable place to live, work and visit and the City of Roanoke has that opportunity with the South Jefferson

Redevelopment project, because it will impact the desirability of the Roanoke region and the City as a location, and it can potentially help one of the most strategically located parts of the City to better meet the economic and social needs of Roanoke today and link the downtown core with a medical center and a desirable residential neighborhood. She stated that the Chamber of Commerce leadership supports the principles of bringing all sections of the City to the highest and best use and the South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan will help to develop this area in a desirable manner appropriate to its location and appropriate to the potential of Roanoke City to build a strong and lasting economy.

Bruce Brenner, President, Cycle Systems, Inc., inquired about the status of the floodplain project and timing of the project as it relates to the South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan; whereupon, the Mayor advised that answers to floodplain issues will be addressed.

Elizabeth Belcher, Roanoke Valley Greenways Coordinator, representing the Roanoke Valley Greenways Commission, advised that the Commission is excited about the project particularly because there are greenways that connect very closely with the South Jefferson Redevelopment project; i.e.: the Mill Mountain Greenway which extends from downtown to the Mill Mountain Star and the Roanoke River Greenway. She further advised that the Mill Mountain Greenway has been designed, engineered and should go to construction in approximately six months after right-of-way issues are resolved, which will provide a connection from the proposed project to downtown and enable persons to go from downtown to the proposed area either on foot or by bicycle without having to use their automobile. She advised that Roanoke River Greenway connections are vitally important to the South Jefferson Redevelopment project because it fronts on the Roanoke River. She expressed appreciation for the fact that greenways have been so closely incorporated into the project, because greenways represent quality of life issues to many people. She encouraged that the City move forward with the South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan and with the greenway components of the project which will provide connections to Smith Park, Wasena Park, Mill Mountain Park, Explore Park and eventually to Greenhill Park in Roanoke County.

At this point, Council Member Harris left the meeting.

Mr. Bob Caudle, 4231 Belford Street, S. W., expressed excitement over the potential of the South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan. He requested that finances be considered very carefully and offered his assistance as a community volunteer.

Ms. Ann Lemon, 3169 Westridge Road, S. W., also expressed excitement regarding the plan and encouraged that the design guidelines be adhered to as the project unfolds. She stated that the design guidelines are cutting edge ideas that are being implemented in other cutting edge cities across the country, particularly

continuation of the commercial buildings on Jefferson Street and the scale of buildings which creates a pedestrian friendly street, more of which is needed in Roanoke. She commended the proposed plan in regard to the railroad crossing area by adhering to existing architecture, and looking at the assets of what is currently in place within this 110 acre area. She expressed appreciation for the South Jefferson Redevelopment Plan which will make the area more user friendly for all citizens to use in various types of ways.

The City Manager advised that this concludes the public hearing; City Council, the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority and the City Planning Commission will go into their separate deliberations of the proposed Redevelopment Plan; and during the month of March each of the respective bodies, as a part of their regular meetings, will discuss the Redevelopment Plan and take the necessary actions culminating in a plan being brought to City Council on March 19, 2001, with a recommendation from the City Planning Commission and the Redevelopment and Housing Authority as it relates to the Plan. She stated that a single public hearing where the three bodies would have the same opportunity to hear interested parties, along with a review of the project, was an important effort and expressed appreciation to Council, the Housing Authority and the City Planning Commission for making special accommodations to conduct the meeting. She advised that questions and comments will be referred to appropriate staff for response.

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting of Roanoke City Council adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

The meetings of the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority and the City Planning Commission were also adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

A P P R O V E D

ATTEST:

Mary F. Parker
City Clerk

Ralph K. Smith
Mayor
